

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT - DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA - COLUMBIA, SC

2012 JUN 13 P 1:26

Jamar Lavart Belk,

Plaintiff,

v.

Bruce Bryant; Freddie Arwood;  
Richard Martin; Tammy Dover;  
Judy Parrish; Betty Kissinger;  
Alqueiese; and James Jewell,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 0:11-2570-SB

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On March 30, 2012, Defendant Jewell filed a motion for summary judgment. The Court subsequently issued a Roseboro order, advising the Plaintiff of the summary judgment procedures and of the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately to the motion. Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975). Despite the specific warnings, the Plaintiff failed to respond to the motion. Due to the Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court issued a second order on May 1, 2012, advising the Plaintiff that it appeared that he was not opposing the motion and that he wished to abandon this action. The Court gave the Plaintiff an additional fourteen days to respond to the motion and specifically warned the Plaintiff that if he failed to respond, then the action would be recommended for dismissal. When the Plaintiff failed to respond to this second order, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") on May 21, 2012, recommending that the

Court dismiss this action for lack of prosecution and terminate the pending motions. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within fourteen days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriners's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo review. Accordingly, after consideration of this matter, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Entry 51) as the Order of this Court, and it is

**ORDERED** that this action is dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any pending motions are hereby terminated.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
Sol Bratt, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

June 12, 2012  
Charleston, South Carolina